

November 3, 2020

Creative Photographers, Inc. (Plaintiff Represented by Emily A. Danchuk, Esq.)

v.

Grind Mode Media, LLC d.b.a. Litviral (Defendant for Case No. 2:20-cv-02557)

Dear United States District Court For The Eastern District Of Pennsylvania:

I, Kenyetta McKinney, agent for Grind Mode Media, LLC, am motioning the Honorable Court to respond to the 'Proof of Service' document that was recently submitted by Emily Danchuk, Esq. and Doniger/Burroughs Law Firm (representing Creative Photographers, Inc.) through the court's system as well as to put on record what attorney I am willing to communicate via email with during the remainder of this process and my reasoning.

Please understand Emily Danchuk, Esq. appears only to be the PA Law licensee. That Grind Mode Media, LLC dba Litviral is really 'fighting' against California-based Law Firm Doniger/Burroughs, who has a reputation for filing hundreds of alleged copyright lawsuits throughout the US per year – at one point holding the most copyright lawsuits filed yearly. I strongly feel Grind Mode Media, LLC, is not even 'fighting' against Creative Photographers, Inc at this point, but Doniger/Burroughs. I feel like I (the agent) am being teamed up by these 'bigger and stronger' attorneys who do nothing but file hundreds of these contingency wins (client gets paid when they do)/jury demand lawsuits all year.

Proof of Service Response:

While still not admitting that they 'served' Grind Mode Media, LLC improperly back in June '20, Emily Danchuk, Esq. & Doniger/Burroughs is now playing what I feel to be 'a not so nice game.' The 'female occupant' referenced is my sister-in-law, as I have stated to both them and the Honorable Court (it is on record). Here are the facts as I know them:

My sister-in-law has stated that the date was the 27th of October (2020) and not the 23rd of October (2020), as outlined in the filed document on November 3, 2020, from their process server. The 'female occupant' also has said that she and the process server were conversing through a closed door, so how would she describe a 'black skin' twenty-year-old female. The main element to all this is the 'female occupant' asserts that the process server asked if she knew someone by another name, and NOT the company of Grind Mode Media, LLC, as well, not my name (of Kenyetta). She said she did not know that person, not the company, because it was NOT a name she was familiar with. It is clear through my filed request that my sister-in-law knows the company, and she knows to be

truthful. On Friday evening, the 30th of October (2020), I obtained an email from Plaintiff's attorney (since my email is now on record with the Honorable Courts), Emily Danchuk, Esq./ Doniger Burroughs stating that I have been evading them and that I need to respond; otherwise, they will advise the courts of my 'apparent evasion of service, and request leave to serve the Secretary of State in Pennsylvania on Grind Mode Media, LLC's (GMM) behalf which will suffice for service of process.'

First, let me say, I was relieved to hear from Ms. Danchuk until I started reading about the alleged 'evasion' (because I am NOT running from anything and have been as proactive as I can be since finding out about the lawsuit). I respectfully replied to advise them that I am not evading them (Emily Danchuk, Esq. plus four other law professionals carbon copied in the email Ms. Danchuk sent as I have been accused of), and they are likely encountering my younger sister-in-law, who may be scared or feel intimidated. If you knew that you had service back from the process server on 'October 30th' the date in which the process server wrote in, which was the 27th of October, not the 23rd as stated on the Proof of Service report, then why would you need to contact me regarding this to say I am evading being served the complaint (again, still not acknowledging that they have to do this because they 'served' the wrong complaint in June which was never handed to anyone). I am sure they could have proceeded with 'unexecuted summons' due to the made-up reasoning provided by the service processor – 'company not known per female occupant.' My email response did not sit well with Doniger (the 'main' attorney for this case), so as a result, this document 'magically' appears today (November 3, 2020). Dating it back to the 23rd of October as being served (when it was the 27th of October that the correspondence took place between my sister-in-law and the process server). I am sure changing the date also has significance, and that is perhaps the Order set-forth by the Honorable Courts.

Who I Am Willing To Communicate Via Email With On Behalf Of Grind Mode Media, LLC:

I want this to go on record that when corresponding with 'Emily Danchuk,' she is carbon-copying at least 2-5 other lawyers (two of which I know are lawyers, the others are in the legal profession, or maybe attorneys, too). When I responded 'all' to the email, it was welcomed with an unfavorable response from the 'big boss,' Stephen Doniger from California. He was not too pleased with what I had to say. Because I am Pro Se on behalf of Grind Mode Media, LLC, I would prefer not to communicate with anyone other than the attorney who has the PA law license right now (Emily Danchuk). It is understandable if she has to carbon copy the others since she is outsourced to work with them, but I would rather only 'chat' with one attorney.

The reasoning behind this is so my words are not twisted and taken out of context (then possibly used against the company down the line), and I am not feeling 'chastised' by a whole team of attorneys, to just me. And as I stated to the attorney, while I am not admitting guilt to anything, I would have to look further into this with the person who did do the upkeep on the website if I am able to get in contact with him since he is in the United Kingdom (because I stand by the fact that I did not RUN Litviral) – as they did attach the right documents to the email for me to see. The documents I should have had back in June '20. I also was willing to listen to a reasonable, realistic, and amicable resolution to this (even though we do not have anything, and I stand by that) because it would be in the best interest to move on from this (since there is a lot going on in my life and I am just trying to survive what is happening in Philadelphia right now along with other personal issues) without continually motioning the court. It was to no avail on the latter. So, to even the 'playing field' – which will, in my opinion, never be even, I would prefer that only Ms. Danchuk communicates with me going further if any email correspondence must occur.

Thank you to the Honorable Courts for your respective time in this matter.

Blessed Regards,

Kenyetta McKinney On Behalf Of Grind Mode Media, LLC